

AD A138263

Research Note 84-51

(1)

THE IMPACT OF REALISTIC JOB PREVIEWS ON
THE ADJUSTMENT OF NEW EMPLOYEES

Bernard L. Dugoni and Daniel R. Ilgen
Purdue University

T. Owen Jacobs, Contracting Officer's Representative

Submitted by

Robert M. Sasmor, Director
BASIC RESEARCH

DTIC FILE COPY



U. S. Army

Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

February 1984

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

This report, as submitted by the contractor, has been cleared for release to Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) to comply with regulatory requirements. It has been given no primary distribution other than to DTIC and will be available only through DTIC or other reference services such as the National Technical Information Service (NTIS). The views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation.

84 02 21 158

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER Research Note 84-51	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. <i>A138263</i>	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) THE IMPACT OF REALISTIC JOB PREVIEWS ON THE ADJUSTMENT OF NEW EMPLOYEES	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Interim Report Series 1977-1978	
7. AUTHOR(s) Bernard L. Dugoni, Daniel R. Ilgen	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER DAHC19-76-G-0017	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Purdue University West Lafayette, IN 47907	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 2Q161102B74F	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS US Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences 5001 Eisenhower Ave. Alexandria, VA 22333	12. REPORT DATE February 1984	
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)	13. NUMBER OF PAGES 29	
	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified	
	15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Realistic Job Previews (RTPs), job satisfaction, job turnover, job expectations		
ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Although it has been shown that new employees who receive realistic information about an organization prior to their entry into it tend to have lower turnover than those who receive positively-biased information, little is known about the process through which this realistic information affects turnover. The present study investigated three possible psychological processes underlying the use of realistic job previews in a field experiment with 320 new employees of a retail food chain.		

(continued)

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

Three psychological processes through which RJP's were hypothesized to lower turnover were suggested. These were: 1) lowered expectations and increased job satisfaction, 2) improved ability to cope with unpleasant job circumstances when they were expected, and 3) the creation of a perceptual set of greater openness and honesty within the company. None of the hypotheses received strong support. The results were discussed primarily in terms of general lack of support for the effects of met expectations on job satisfaction. This report is the fifth in a series entitled "Motivational Consequences of Perceived Job Environments: The Critical Role of Feedback in Initial Work Experience."

Dimension For	
1. SFAAI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. X	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Learned	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Selected	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dimensions	
1. A	2. B
3. C	4. D
5. E	6. F
7. G	8. H
9. I	10. J
11. K	12. L
13. M	14. N
15. O	16. P
17. Q	18. R
19. S	20. T
21. U	22. V
23. W	24. X
25. Y	26. Z
Comments	
A1	



Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

Realistic Job Previews and the Adjustment of New Employees

The initial contact between prospective organizational members and those within the organization responsible for meeting staffing needs is often a frustrating experience for everyone. Both the organization and the individual have a need to gather accurate information about the other in order to reach a decision. Yet, both feel a need to look attractive to the other which increases the possibility of biasing the information exchanged (Porter, Lawler, Hackman, 1975).

In 1956, Weitz demonstrated that if organizations resisted the temptation to present themselves to prospective employees in an unrealistically positive light, and instead, described some of the unpleasant features of the job as well as the positive ones; it was no more difficult to attract new employees. More importantly, the use of this more realistic information reduced turnover. Since Weitz's original research, similar effects of such information which Wanous (1973) termed Realistic Job Previews (RJPs) have been found in a variety of settings (see for example, Goversall and Meyers, 1966; Ilgen and Seely, 1974; Macedonia, 1969; Youngblood, 1963; Wanous, 1973).

Although the evidence is quite strong that RJPs affect turnover, little has been done to examine why the effects occur. The purpose of this research was to investigate several possible causes for the effects of RJPs on turnover in a field experimental setting.

The most commonly accepted explanation for why RJPs work is that proposed by Porter and Steers (1973), Wanous (1973), and others (Dunnette, Arvey, And Banas, 1973; Katzell, 1968; Weitz, 1956). This position hypothesizes that RJPs lower initial expectations. Furthermore, it is

argued that lower expectations are more easily met on the job than higher expectations. As a result, those holding lower expectations should be more satisfied with their jobs assuming that unmet expectations are less satisfying than met expectations (Porter and Steers, 1973). Since satisfaction consistently has been found to correlate negatively with turnover (Porter and Steers, 1973), it is hypothesized that RJP's lower turnover by producing higher levels of job satisfaction among those exposed to them as compared to those who receive the information typically available.

In spite of the acceptance of this "met expectations" hypothesis, very few have explored the necessary links in this model. Only Wanous (1973) showed that initial expectations were lowered by RJP's. However, he found no significant effects of satisfaction on turnover in his sample.

A second mechanism for RJP effects on turnover is that they may improve the new employee's ability to cope with the job (Ilgen and Seely, 1974; Wanous, 1977). If employees are made aware of problems to be faced on the job, they may cope with them better when the problems arise, either by being less disturbed by the problem when it comes up or by pre-rehearsing methods of handling the problem. With respect to the former alternative, Finkelman and Glass (1970) found that stress was reduced if an event was predictable rather than unpredictable.

Finally, the RJP's may convey, indirectly, a message of openness and honesty to the recipient. To the extent that applicants generalize this to the organization, those who receive RJP's may believe that the organization is likely to deal with them in an open and honest manner. Assuming that nothing occurs on the job to dispell such beliefs, the net result

should be an increase in the attractiveness of the organization to the individual.

The present research was designed to investigate the extent to which each of these psychological processes may have operated in a field setting in which RJP's were administered. Although three explanations were investigated, it should be stressed at the outset that none of the three excludes the possibility of the others' occurrence. That is, the three hypotheses are not mutually exclusive in the strong inference sense (Platt, 1964).

Method

Participants

Four-hundred-fifty employees in the customer service department of several retail outlets of a large midwest retail food chain participated in the research. All were either checkers or baggers in the check-out lanes and were classified as permanent part-time employees. This classification referred to the fact that the employees worked approximately 30 or less hours per week on a permanent basis. Although the stores were part of a food chain, the retail outlets carried a wide range of merchandise. Departments such as hardware, clothing, garden supplies, etc., were served by the checkers and baggers in addition to groceries. Each store had a staff of approximately 200 permanent part-time employees responsible for the jobs of checker and bagger.

Two groups of employees participated in the research. First, 130 employees who had been with the company for not less than six months nor more than a year were used to develop the realistic orientation program. The remaining 320 employees in the study were new hires in one of two

stores that were opening for the first time. The field experiment was conducted with the latter group.

Realistic Preview Material

In order to develop the content for the realistic preview, a survey was conducted with a sample of 130 new employees. The questionnaire consisted mainly of the following two open-ended questions.

1. "Describe in your own words, something that happened while working that made you feel very good about your job. I felt very good about my job when ..."

2. "Now, describe in your own words something that happened while working that made you feel very bad about your job. I felt very bad about my job when ..."

Two raters independently sorted responses to each of the statements into categories. They then discussed each statement on which they had not agreed as to its location in a category and arrived at a consensus. Five areas of concern were identified in this fashion. These were: Customer relations, co-workers, supervision, duties/policies, and hours.

Materials for the RJP orientation program consisted mainly of the data from the survey with detailed descriptions of specific critical incidents that were representative of the five areas identified. For example, under the topic of hours, it was pointed out that work schedules were set one to two weeks in advance but that sometimes situations arose which required last minute changes. It was pointed out that an effort was made to avoid these problems but that they happened frequently and other employees like themselves sometimes were upset when they had to work on what they had thought would be their day off.

Procedure

Three-hundred-twenty employees participated in the field experiment. All were new hires in one of two new stores which opened within one month of each other. Approximately one month prior to the stores' opening, all newly hired checkers and baggers were randomly scheduled to report for an orientation session. The orientation sessions were run in groups of approximately 30.

Two types of orientation sessions were conducted. The first (termed the control) presented the company's standard orientation which emphasized primarily administrative details, company policy, the completion of payroll forms, etc. In addition, at the completion of the session, all new hires filled out an Initial Expectations Scale which is described in detail below. The session lasted about two hours.

The second type of session (the experimental session) consisted of the same material as the control but also included a thirty-minute presentation of the results from the survey. This presentation involved a description of the survey and a discussion of its results with large graphs and charts as illustrations for emphasis. The survey data were presented at the beginning of the session. The sessions themselves (experimental and control) were counterbalanced as to time of presentation to control for order effects and were conducted at both stores. Although having both treatments at the same stores increased the chance of contamination which would weaken the effect size (Cooke and Campbell, 1976), major differences in the socio-economic characteristics of the two stores made it unwise to confound treatment with store.

Three months after the new employees had been on the job, a second

questionnaire was administered. On one day during a two-week period, each employee was given the questionnaire and a return envelope addressed to us at Purdue. The questionnaire was completed on company time. Employees were informed of their right not to participate and two persons chose not to do so.

Measures

Initial Expectations. Items were constructed to tap the five content areas to which the orientation was directed (i.e., customer relations, co-workers, supervisor, duties/policies, and hours). Items within the subscales were selected to measure a heterogeneous sample of events dealing with that category so as to represent, as much as possible, the issues raised in the survey. These items were imbedded in a longer scale asking expectations about other issues covered in the orientation of both groups in order to make the items of concern less obtrusive. All items required employees to rate the extent to which they expected the condition described would be the case on their job using a six point scale with the following anchors: never true, almost never true, sometimes true, frequently true, nearly always true, and always true. Job expectations scores for each of the five categories were based upon the sum of items within the category, with appropriate items reverse scored so that high scores reflected a "positive" (i.e., "pleasant") expectation. Due to the heterogeneity of the items on each scale, internal consistency reliabilities ranged from .37 to .79.

Perceived Job Situation. After the employees had been on the job two months, the same thirty-five items again were administered. This time they were asked to describe their job as it was rather than as they expected

it to be. The same six-item scale was used and five subscales of job perception were formed.

Job Satisfaction. The measure of satisfaction dealt both with overall job satisfaction and with satisfaction with specific aspects of the job. The questions in the specific job satisfaction portion of the questionnaire dealt with the particular situations mentioned in the RJP, and paralleled the expectations questionnaire. As before, the five subscales were also constructed. Internal consistencies for these scales as measured by Cronbach's alpha ranged from .23 for Duties to .95 for Supervisors. The Overall satisfaction was simply the sum of items comprising the subscales (Coefficient Alpha = .77). In addition, the short form of the MSQ (Weiss, Davis, England, and Lofquist, 1967) was administered, and it correlated .79 with the overall satisfaction measure. From this high correlation it was concluded that the constructed scale was sufficiently valid to be used as the measure of overall job satisfaction.

Coping. The coping scale was a self-perception measure of how well the employees felt they coped with specific incidents selected to measure each of the five areas covered in the orientation. Participants were presented with a critical incident (e.g., "A customer insisted on double bags.") and were asked to rate (1) the frequency with which they had encountered the incident, (2) how well they felt they handled the situation, (3) how upset they felt they had been when they first encountered the incident, and (4) the extent to which they had thought about the event prior to its occurrence. The four responses were not combined although the first (frequency of occurrence) was used to eliminate from the coping analyses those individuals who had never encountered the event.

Turnover. Turnover data were collected from the company records over the first six months of each store's operation. During the first two months, there were a number of changes in personnel. For one thing, the first 30 days of employment was considered to be a "trial period" for the employees and for the company. Within this time, employees who were not performing at a satisfactory level could be dismissed without justification. Further, employees who remained on the job after 30 days were required to join the union. During the first two months, 156 employees terminated with the organization. This included voluntary turnover ($N = 28$), lay-offs ($N = 94$), and those fired ($N = 34$). Most of those who terminated were either laid-off or fired. The main reason for this was the unexpectedly low sales volume during the initial months of the stores' operation due primarily to extremely severe weather conditions. An examination of the lay-off data showed that approximately equal proportions of employees were laid off from each treatment group.

Following the first two months period, most terminations were due to voluntary turnover rather than layoffs and being fired. Of those who left the organization between the second and the sixth month, 25 were classified as voluntary turnover, 29 as layoffs, and 16 as fired. For the purpose of analysis, turnover was considered to be those people who left between the second and sixth month unless otherwise indicated.

Climate

The final scale consisted of items asking for employees' responses toward the company. Eleven items dealt with the extent to which the employees felt the company was open and honest with them (Coefficient Alpha=.81). All items were measured on a six-point scale ranging from never true to always true.

RESULTS

To test the effects of the RJP's on expectations, satisfaction, coping, and climate, a multivariate analysis of variance was used (Morrison, 1967). An examination of the "profiles" formed by the mean scores on each of the variables showed no difference between groups in the pattern of scores ($F = 1.6$; $DF = 7.111$; n.s.). Rather, the differences between groups was a function of the level of the scores. These results are shown in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Expectations and Perceptions

An inspection of the means from the analyses of Table 1 showed that, as expected, expectations were significantly lower in the experimental group ($\bar{x} = 3.85$) than in the control ($\bar{x} = 4.21$). However, the reverse was true for perceptions of the job at the end of three months ($\bar{z}_e = 3.96$ vs. $\bar{z}_c = 3.76$). This finding was not expected.

To examine the expectation and perception effects further, the two were treated as repeated measures within both the experimental and control groups because the items that comprised the scales were identical except for orientation -- i.e. future vs. present. Table 2 shows that the job as perceived by the experimental group once they were on the job was not significantly different from what they had expected. The control group, on the other hand, found their job to deliver significantly less than they had expected of it.

Insert Table 2 about here

In order to examine the differences in expectations and perceptions

more closely, the five subscales of each scale were analyzed separately. These results are shown in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 about here

For these data, the experimental group held significantly lower expectations in all categories except supervisors. In this case, the expectations were significantly higher. With regard to job perceptions, although the difference between groups on the overall perception scale was significant, none of the individual subscales showed significant differences between the groups.

Satisfaction

Table 1 showed that the two groups did not differ in their overall job satisfaction. A second satisfaction measure compared the groups on the five categories covered in the RJP. On none of these measures was there a significant difference between groups. It must be concluded that the RJP had no effect on job satisfaction in this study.

Turnover

As noted above, those who left the company between the second and sixth months could be classified into one of three categories -- quits (voluntary turnover), layoffs, and fired. For the purpose of analysis, those who quit were combined with those who were fired because both forms of terminations were likely to have involved behaviors to which the RJP was directed. In the case of voluntary turnover, the relevance is obvious. With regard to those who were fired, the termination decision was based upon their supervisors' belief that

they were extremely poor performers. Since it was hypothesized that RJP's may aid individuals in adjusting to the demands of their new jobs, it was reasoned that the RJP should improve early performance by allowing the individual to avoid some of the initial mistakes that might lead to poor performance. On the other hand, it was difficult to conclude very much about those who were laid off. They had not decided to leave on their own and they had not performed poorly enough to be dismissed.

In fact, one year later, nearly all those laid off had been offered the chance to return to work. In all further analyses, those who quit plus those who were fired were considered turnover.

Table 4 shows that the difference between the experimental and the control group on the combined measure was marginally significant using a test for the difference between proportions (Downie and Starry, 1977).

Insert Table 4 about here

Met Expectations

The major explanatory concept for the reason RJP's help to reduce turnover has been that they lower initial expectations which in turn lead to greater satisfaction once on the job. Satisfaction in turn leads to lower turnover.

Several analyses investigated the effects of met expectations. First, two sets of measures were constructed to index met expectations. The first was the simple difference between expectations and perceptions, matching on items and calculated within each of the five dimensions as well as over all five. Secondly, in recognition of the problems with difference scores, residual gain scores were constructed. Here initial expectations were used

to get predicted perception scores for each employee, then actual perception scores were subtracted from the predicted ones to create a residual gain measure of net expectations.

First, the effects of experimental treatments on net expectations were explored using the simple difference measures (see Table 3). The residual gain measures were inappropriate because they statistically removed the effect of initial expectations from the gain score when the RJP's were designed precisely to create the initial difference. Net expectations were significantly different between the two groups on supervision for hours (see Table 3). It should be noted that the direction of difference for supervisors was opposite that predicted.

Correlational analyses related net expectations to both turnover and satisfaction. None of the net expectation indices were significantly correlated with turnover (see Table 5). As is shown in Table 5, several of the net expectations variables were related to satisfaction. However, these correlations were artifactual; they were due entirely to the correlation between perceptions and satisfaction. To substantiate this conclusion, multiple regression analyses were run entering perception scores first and residual gain scores second to predict satisfaction. In none of the analyses did net expectations contribute significantly to the change in R^2 over-and-above perceptions alone although they approached a significance. For co-worker satisfaction the increase was marginally significant.
($\Delta R^2 = .06$, $p \leq .10$).

Insert Table 5 about here

Coping

An examination of differences between experimental and control groups

did not support the hypothesis that people who receive RJP's are better able to cope with problems on the job. However, further examination of the coping measure revealed that the experimental group reported encountering significantly fewer of the problem situations ($p \leq .05$). Since one would expect that people working on the same job in the same setting would encounter the same types of situations, this result was unexpected. It suggested the possibility that the employees who had received a realistic preview knew what to expect and did not view some of the situations as problems, therefore remembering them or occurring less frequently. Clearly, this is not the only possible explanation of this result but it does suggest that future research attempt to measure coping more carefully.

Climate

There were no significant differences between groups on the climate scale. However, the observed difference in perceptions of supervision mentioned above may be an indirect indication that RJP's can influence some climate-related aspects. This will be discussed more fully later.

DISCUSSION

Consistent with the findings of Wanous (1973), those who received RJP's had less of a tendency to overestimate what their jobs could provide them. This was true for their expectations about customers, co-workers, employee duties and company policies, and for the hours they would work. There was, however, one notable exception to the lowered expectations. Expectations about supervision were raised not lowered. This result was unexpected because the orientation had pointed out both positive and negative events related

to supervisors in the same way the other categories were presented. Perhaps when the employees received negative information about the company from company personnel during the orientation, the information may have seemed somewhat out of character compared to what they expected to hear from a company representative. As a result, they may have expected the company personnel in general, to be very concerned for the employees as evidenced by an orientation program like they were hearing. This may have generalized to their expectations about their own supervisor who would be seen as the company representative at their level.

A second unexpected finding was that overall, control group members perceived their job in a more positive fashion at the end of the first two months than did members of the experimental group. However, when perceptions of each of the five job categories were explored the two groups differed on none of them. Therefore, the effect on perception was impossible to isolate and was not very meaningful. Nevertheless, future work with RJP's should consider the possibility that the preview may create a perceptual set which may, in turn, influence the way in which the job actually is perceived once on the job.

The well-entrenched hypothesis that RJP's lower expectations and, as a result, increase satisfaction by improving the match between what is expected and what is experienced clearly was not supported. The lack of support was surprising given the widespread acceptance of the hypothesis (see for example, Porter and Steers, 1973, and Wannous, 1977).

In spite of its general acceptance, several factors led us to question the met expectations hypothesis. First of all, our own data showed that when initial expectations were lowered and turnover correlated

significantly with satisfaction (a negative correlation), the link between met expectations and satisfaction did not exist. Therefore, the most direct conclusion was that perhaps met expectations do not lead to satisfaction. Second, a search through the early job expectations literature did little to increase our confidence in the original hypothesis. Only one study demonstrated a statistically reliable correlation between initial expectations and later job satisfaction (Youngblood, 1963) when initial expectations were assessed by some method other than asking individuals to recall their earlier expectations. Finally, Katerberg (Reference Note 1) found no support for met expectations influencing job satisfaction in a sample of Air Force enlisted men. Therefore, let us consider in depth the met expectations hypothesis.

In its purest sense the met expectations hypothesis states that satisfaction with Outcome 1 is a function of the difference between the expected level of Outcome 1 and the level perceived to be present in the job (Ilgen, 1971). The expected level becomes the standard to which the individual compares the perceived return in order to "calculate" his or her level of satisfaction with Outcome 1. RJP's are said to influence satisfaction through their influence on the standard to which job outcomes are compared. The top half of Figure 1 depicts this process.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Locke (1969, 1976) criticized the met expectation model and proposed a model using values as a central concept with comparisons to valued states as the process by which satisfaction was determined. He argued that only if one knows the level of an outcome desired or wanted by the individual can

one infer the individual's level of satisfaction. Furthermore, with regard to expectations, he felt that the only affective response to unmet expectations is surprise (which can be either positive or negative).

In general, we agree with Locke's position and acknowledge that, at times, the work with RJP's and other attempts to influence expectations have been fuzzy in their conceptualizations. On the other hand, we would not agree that expectations are unimportant. First of all, although expectations are, technically, value free, the expectations created in RJP's are seldom value free. Furthermore, their value is consistent enough across people so as to be well known. For example, one of our items in the orientation program dealt with cleaning the restrooms. As part of their job, baggers were required to clean the employee break area and restrooms. Although no assessment was made about the extent to which each new employee "wanted" to perform this duty, we doubt that our estimate of the extent to which employees valued this outcome was too far off. The expectations typically dealt with in RJP's have correlated sufficiently highly with value states among members of the sample that measures of expectations often have served the same function as levels of values. Nevertheless, expectations and values certainly are not synonymous and should have been kept separate conceptually. Again using our example, by making new employees aware of the need to clean the restrooms, we most likely had little impact on their value; we lowered their expectations but certainly not their values. As a result, we doubt that the experimental subjects enjoyed this duty any more than the controls.

The influence of expectations through RJP's is important when the expectations actually alter the new employee's value state. This is most

likely to occur when the employee is uncertain about what is a "good" return on an outcome from the job. Ilgen (Ilgen, 1971; Ilgen and Hamstra, 1972) found that unmet expectations about performance only affected satisfaction when performance feedback was ambiguous. When it was obvious to the subjects that they had done extremely well or extremely poorly, their affective response to feedback was entirely a function of the level of feedback. Similarly, we would hypothesize that our orientation in the present study had little or no impact on how much the employees wanted on such factors as changing their work schedule at the last minute but perhaps did influence what they considered a reasonable number of hours to work each week. The first solid line in the bottom half of Figure 1 depicts how RJP's may impact on values.

We also suggest that expectations about one outcome (Outcome i) may influence expectations about another outcome (Outcome j). For example, information about unpleasant job duties given by supervisors may lead to perceptions that supervisors are high on considerate behavior. Our data indicates that such effects may have occurred. Recall that those who received the RJP orientation held higher initial expectations about supervision than did the controls. The orientation itself may have had unintended consequence of raising expectations about supervision.

Figure 1 suggests that these expectations for outcomes other than those directly addressed by the information may impact on values and/or perceived outcomes. The effects on values should be similar to those described above. In the case of perceptions of received outcomes, a set may be created based upon the orientation which influences perceptions of the job environment. To some extent, the data in the present study showed

some tendency for a set effect. Table 1 reported that when all job perceptions were considered, the experimental group members perceived a lower return from their job than did members of the control group. Supplemental analyses showed that this occurred only in one store. For this store, all of the five job dimensions were perceived as less favorable by members of the experimental group. This effect was not expected but indicates that to use RJP's one must consider the possibility that a set may be created which leads to lower estimations of the job's returns once on the job.

Summary and Conclusions

In the past there has been an over-reliance on the simplistic assumption that RJP's affect turnover by creating a better match between new employees' expectations about their job and their actual perceptions of it once on the job. It was suggested that RJP's will influence satisfaction with any given job facet (or outcome) only under conditions that they (1) alter the individual's beliefs or values about what are desirable levels (i.e., what is wanted) of the outcome in question, or (2) alter the individual's perception of the job characteristics through the creation of a perceptual set.

Since valued states are more stable and less subject to change than expectations (Ilgen and Hamstra, 1971; Locke, 1969, 1976), we would predict that, for most individuals and for most job outcomes, job perceptions would predict considerably more of the variance in outcome satisfaction than met expectations. Such was certainly the case in the present study and in the Air Force study by Katerberg (Reference Note 1). Both found satisfaction related to perceptions but no contribution of met expectations to satisfaction when perceptions were controlled. Katerberg concluded that job environments

control most of the variance in satisfaction (a position supported by Herman, Dunham, and Hulin, 1976) and that realistic job expectations would add that this is due to the general stability of individuals' values or wants.

From the data presented here as well as from other research to date on RJP's, it appears that one or more of the following conditions appear to be necessary for the usefulness of RJP's.

- 1) The values which are affected by the outcomes or events discussed in the RJP's must be sufficiently unstable in the applicants so that it is possible to influence these value stages through the RJP's.
- 2) The dimensions or factors of the job environment discussed in the RJP's must not be so concrete or obvious in the actual job environment so as to preclude the influence of the employees' perceptual set on their perception of the job dimensions if a set effect is desired.
- 3) The RJP information should be given in a manner which allows for the employee to form general impressions about the organization's concern for employees.
- 4) If RJP's are to improve the employees' early performance on the job, the material presented should allow for the anticipation of job problems and perhaps provide ways to deal with these problems.
- 5) The use of RJP's should always be accompanied by a thorough assessment of the job environment to assure that the previews are truly realistic. Since the use of RJP's may inadvertently inflate expectations about climate as in the case of supervisors, it may be useful to combine use of RJP's with a program familiarizing supervisors with the orientation process and helping them to be more aware of the special needs of new employees.

Reference Notes

1. Katerberg, R. The correlates of expectations and perceptions in a military training organization. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois, May, 1977.

References

- Cook, T. D. and Campbell, D. T. The design and conduct of quasi-experiments and true experiments in field settings. In Dunnette, M. D. (Ed.) Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.
- Berlew, D. E. and Hall, D. T. The socialization of managers: Effects of expectations on performance. Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 1966, 11, 207-223.
- Downie, N. M. and Starry, A. Basic Statistical Methods, New York: Harper and Row, 1977.
- Dunnette, M. D., Arvey, R. D., and Banas, P. A. Why do they leave? Personnel, 1973, May-June, 25-39.
- Finkelman, J. M. and Glass, D. C. Reappraisal of the relationship between noise and human performance by means of a subsidiary task measure. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1970, 54, 211-213.
- Goversall, E. R. and Meyers, M. S. Breakthrough in on-the-job-training. Harvard Business Review, 1966, 44, 62-72.
- Ilgen, D. R. Satisfaction with performance as a function of the initial level of expected performance and the deviation from expectations. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1971, 6, 345.
- Ilgen, D. R. and Seely, W. Realistic expectations as an aid in reducing voluntary resignations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 452-456.
- Katzell, M. E. Expectations and dropouts in schools of nursing. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1968, 52, 154-157.

- Locke, E. A. What is job satisfaction? Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1969, 4, 309-336.
- Locke, E. A. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In Dunnette, M. D. (Ed.) The Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.
- Morrison, D. F. Multivariate Statistical Methods, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Nesbitt, R. E. and Wilson, T. D. C. Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports and mental processes. Psychological Review, 1977, 84 (3), 231-259.
- Platt, I. R. Strong inference. Science, 1964, 146, 346-352.
- Porter, L. W., Lawler, E. E. III and Hackman, J. R. Behavior in Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Porter, L. W. and Steers, R. M. Organizational, work, and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 151-168.
- Wanous, J. P. Effects of realistic job previews on job acceptance, job attitudes, and job survival. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 58, 327-332.
- Wanous, J. P. Organizational entry: The transition from outsider to newcomer to insider. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1976, 61, 22-30.
- Wanous, J. P. Organizational entry: Newcomers moving from outside to inside. Psychological Bulletin, 1977, 84, 601-618.
- Weitz, J. Job expectancy and survival. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1956, 40, 245-247.
- Youngberg, C. F. An experimental study of job satisfaction and turnover in relation to job expectations and self expectations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. New York University, 1963.

Footnote

The research was supported by Grant No. DAHC 19-76-G-0017 from the Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. Although the support was greatly appreciated, the views expressed herein are the authors' and not necessarily those of the agency or the U.S. Army. The authors also wish to thank Howard Weiss for his many helpful comments throughout the conduct of this research and personnel at the participating organization for their support. Portions of this paper were presented at the Academy of Management meetings, August 1977.

¹We have placed "calculate" in quotes to indicate that the individual need not consciously make this comparison or be able to report that satisfaction was based on this comparison. Nesbitt and Wilson (1977) in a thought-provoking review clearly demonstrate that cognitive processes such as this comparison clearly do take place and yet individuals are unaware and/or unable to verbalize the way in which they have reached a given conclusion or state.

Table 1. Multivariate Analysis of Variance: Expectations, Perceptions, Satisfaction, Coping, and Climate by Treatment Groups

Eigenvalue	Wilks Lambda	F	Hypoth. d.f.	Error d.f.	Signif.
.187	.84280	2.958	7	111	.01

Univariate Tests [d.f. = (1,117)]

	<u>F</u>	<u>Signif.</u>
Expectations	15.62	≤ .01
Perceptions	5.27	≤ .05
Satisfaction	0.38	n.s.
Coping (Handled Situation)	4.98	≤ .05
Coping (How Upset)	3.20	≤ .10
Climate (Openness)	1.69	n.s.

Table 2. Differences Between Expectations and Perceptions by Treatment Group

	Expectations (Time 1)	Perceptions (Time 2)	t	p-level
Experimental	3.85	3.78	-1.98	n.s.
Control	4.12	3.92	-2.89	$\leq .01$

Table 3. Comparisons of Mean Initial Expectations and Later Job Environment Perceptions for Experimental (RJPs) and Control Groups.

Expectations ^{1, 2}	Experimental		Control		t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Avg. of All Items	3.85	.350	4.04	.476	-4.17**
Customers	3.63	.927	4.07	.952	-4.12**
Co-workers	3.21	.642	3.64	.776	-5.52**
Supervisors	4.47	1.492	4.01	1.624	2.88**
Duties/Policies	2.91	1.180	3.66	1.353	-5.19**
Hours	3.21	.787	3.87	.740	-7.74**
 Perceptions ^{1, 3}					
Avg. of All Items	3.76	.349	3.92	.417	-2.30*
Customers	3.71	.806	3.85	.885	-0.85
Co-workers	3.10	.618	3.30	.777	-1.52
Supervisors	4.12	1.350	4.41	1.171	1.17
Duties/Policies	4.50	1.275	4.79	1.365	-1.14
Hours	3.10	.706	3.30	.814	-1.42
 Met Expectations (Difference Measure)					
Avg. of All Items	-0.10	.400	-0.19	.472	1.24
Customers	0.15	1.268	-0.30	1.297	1.62
Co-workers	-0.22	.799	-0.49	1.157	1.28
Supervisors	-0.34	2.037	0.53	1.949	-1.98*
Duties/Policies	1.77	1.716	1.16	1.892	1.75
Hours	-0.14	.996	-0.57	1.039	2.17*

¹ Higher scores indicate more favorable events.

² Ns were 169 and 151 for the experimental and control groups, respectively.

³ Ns were 70 and 49 for the experimental and control groups, respectively.

* p<.05

** p<.01

Table 4. Tests for Differences Between Proportions of Six-month Turnover.

	EXPERIMENTAL	CONTROL	t	p
Quit	.190	.245	-1.19	.12
Fired	.125	.139	-0.37	.56
Total (Quit+Fired)	.316	.384	-1.27	.10

Table 5. Correlations of Turnover and Satisfaction with the Major Explanatory Variables Across the Experimental Groups.

	Turnover	Overall	Customers	Co-workers	Supervisors	Duties	Hours	Satisfaction
Expectations								
Overall	-.04	.14	.07	.03	.01	.18*	.14	
Customers	.11	.01	.19*	.17	-.10	.09	-.07	
Co-workers	.06	.18*	.08	.19*	.10	.17	.16	
Supervisors	.08	.06	-.11	.01	.08	-.07	.18	
Duties	.04	-.08	.05	-.13	-.08	-.10	.09	
Hours	-.10	.04	.01	-.13	-.08	.08	.02	
Perceptions								
Overall	-.12	.50***	.17	.10	.43***	.29***	.41*	
Customers	-.06	.23*	.31***	.17	.19*	.25**	.06	
Co-workers	-.03	.32***	.20*	.14	.21*	.14	.27*	
Supervisors	.06	.23*	.03	.04	.34***	-.01	.14	
Duties	-.02	-.11	-.04	-.04	-.14	-.05	-.09	
Hours	-.14	.30***	.09	.24**	.19*	.31***	.47*	
Satisfaction								
Overall	-.20*	--	.45***	.51***	.71***	.65***	.70*	
Customers	-.13	--	--	.31***	.10	.34***	.17	
Co-workers	-.04	--	--	--	.26**	.33***	.18	
Supervisors	-.00	--	--	--	--	.32***	.45*	
Duties	-.23*	--	--	--	--	--	.38*	
Hours	-.21*	--	--	--	--	--	--	
Coping (Handle Situation)								
	-.10	-.01	.06	-.17	-.09	.08	-.04	
Climate								
	-.12	.47***	.07	.21*	.46***	.22*	.47*	
Met Expectations								
Overall	-.08	.32***	.09	.06	.38***	.11	.24	
Customers	-.14	.19	.09	-.02	.29**	.14	.12	
Co-workers	.03	.09	.10	-.05	.07	-.04	.06	
Supervisors	-.02	.17	.14	.04	.22*	.09	-.04	
Duties	-.05	-.04	-.06	.02	-.09	.01	-.14	
Hours	-.02	.27**	.07	.33***	.20*	.19	.34	

* p<.05

** p<.01

*** p<.001

Figure 1
Impact of Realistic Job Information on Job Satisfaction

Net Expectations Model

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left(\frac{\text{Perceived Amount}}{\text{Expected level}} - \frac{\text{Perceived Outcome}_1}{\text{Received from Job}} \right) = \frac{\text{Satisfaction with}}{\text{Outcome}_1} + \\
 & \left(\frac{\text{Perceived Outcome}_1}{\text{Received}} - \frac{\text{Outcome}_1}{\text{Expected}} \right) = \frac{\text{Satisfaction with}}{\text{Outcome}_1} + \\
 & \left(\frac{\text{Perceived Outcome}_1+T}{\text{Received}} - \frac{\text{Outcome}_1+T}{\text{Expected}} \right) = \frac{\text{Satisfaction with}}{\text{Outcome}_1+T}
 \end{aligned}$$

Information
Designed to
Establish Realistic
Expectations
About Outcome_1

Value Orientation Model

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left(\frac{\text{Expected Level}}{\text{Valued (Wanted)}} - \frac{\text{Perceived Amount}}{\text{Expected level}} \right) = \frac{\text{Satisfaction with}}{\text{Outcome}_1} + \\
 & \left(\frac{\text{Expected level}}{\text{Valued (Wanted)}} - \frac{\text{Level of}}{\text{Outcome}_1} \right) = \frac{\text{Satisfaction with}}{\text{Outcome}_1} + \\
 & \left(\frac{\text{Perceived Outcome}_1}{\text{Received from Job}} - \frac{\text{Valued (Wanted)}}{\text{Level of}} \right) = \frac{\text{Satisfaction with}}{\text{Outcome}_1} + \\
 & \left(\frac{\text{Perceived Outcome}_1+T}{\text{Received}} - \frac{\text{Valued (Wanted)}}{\text{Level of}} \right) = \frac{\text{Satisfaction with}}{\text{Outcome}_1+T} + \\
 & \left(\frac{\text{Perceived Outcome}_1+T}{\text{Received}} - \frac{\text{Valued (Wanted)}}{\text{Level of}} \right) = \frac{\text{Satisfaction with}}{\text{Outcome}_1+T}
 \end{aligned}$$

= Job Satisfaction

+

= Job Satisfaction

= Job Satisfaction

+

= Job Satisfaction